PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO DESIGNATE A TYPE SPECIES FOR THE GENUS "HYMENOCERA" LATREILLE, 1819 (CLASS CRUSTACEA, ORDER DECAPODA) IN HARMONY WITH CURRENT USAGE

By L. B. HOLTHUIS

(*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)648)

The generic name *Hymenocera* Latreille, 1819, at present is generally used for an indo-west-Pacific genus of marine prawns belonging to the family GNATHOPHYLLIDAE. The genus at present is known to contain two species, *Hymenocera picta* Dana, 1852, and *H. elegans* Heller, 1861, which possibly even may be identical. These species are rather rare and I know of only 20 authors having employed the generic name *Hymenocera* for the present genus. The only other generic name ever proposed for it is *Nematophyllum* Bleeker, which was published in 1856 by Bleeker in a narrative of a trip in the Dutch East Indies (*Reis Minahassa Moluksch. Arch.* **2** : 37). The name *Nematophyllum* has been overlooked by all subsequent authors and was even missed in Neave's *Nomenclator Zoologicus.* Bleeker's name *Nematophyllum* is not valid, since it is a junior homonym of *Nematophyllum* Milne Edwards & Haime, 1850 (*Brit. foss. Corals* (1) : lxxi). Neither in the original description of *Hymenocera* Latreille, 1819, nor in that of *Nematophyllum* Bleeker, 1856, was a nominal species mentioned.

2. The generic name *Hymenocera* has been consistently used for the genus discussed here, except on the single occasion when Bleeker employed the name *Nematophyllum* for it. Furthermore, there is not the least doubt that Latreille's description of *Hymenocera* was based on material of the genus for which this name is currently employed. Nevertheless, it would be necessary, under the strict application of the *Règles*, to use the name *Hymenocera* for an entirely different genus. During the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology held in Paris in 1948, namely, it was decided that " where, prior to 1st January 1931, a generic name was published for a genus established . . . with no nominal species distinctly referred to it, the first nominal species to be subsequently so referred to it by the same or another author is to be deemed to have been an originally included species and that species automatically becomes the type species of the genus in question " (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** (7/9) : 160). Now the first nominal species ever placed in the genus *Hymenocera* Latreille is, as far as known to me, *Hymenocera nipponensis* De Haan, 1844, a species at present regarded as belonging in the genus *Conchodytes* Peters, 1852.

3. In 1844, there was published pl. 46 of W. de Haan's volume on the Crustacea of Ph. Fr. von Siebold's *Fauna Japonica.* On this plate, the species shown in fig. 8 is stated to represent "*Hymenocera niponensis* n.sp." This name obviously is a mistake, as the species figured does not show the characters mentioned in Latreille's diagnosis of his genus *Hymenocera.* The text belonging to De Haan's plate 46 was published in 1849, and in this text De Haan corrected his error by giving the species the name *Pontonia* *nipponensis* (De Haan, 1849, *Fauna Japon.*, Crust. (6) : 180). This, however, does not alter the fact that *Hymenocera nipponensis* De Haan is the first nominal species to be referred to the genus *Hymenocera* and thus, according to the *Règles*, is the type species of that genus.

4. Unless it is rectified by the Commission, De Haan's 1844 mistake would have very serious consequences, since under a strict application of the *Règles* in the present case the following changes would be necessary. First, the generic name *Hymenocera* Latreille, 1819, would have to be transferred from the genus for which it always has been used to the genus which at present is known as *Conchodytes* Peters, 1852. Second, a new name would be needed for the former genus. These changes would be highly undesirable since (1) the transfer of a name from one genus to another usually leads to serious nomenclatorial confusion, (2) the name *Hymenocera* was clearly intended by Latreille, 1819, for the genus to which it is currently applied, (3) the original diagnosis of *Hymenocera* Latreille does not at all fit for the genus *Conchodytes* Peters, (4) apart from the obscure generic name *Nematophyllum* Bleeker, the only generic name ever used for Latreille's genus is *Hymenocera*, (5) apart from De Haan's 1844 mistake in using the generic name *Hymenocera* for *Conchodytes nipponensis* (De Haan), that generic name has never been employed for a species of the genus *Conchodytes*.

5. The following supplementary notes need to be added in connection with the present application :—

(1) *Conchodytes* Peters, 1852. Hilgendorf, 1879 (*Mber. Akad. Wiss. Berlin* **1878** : 835), when dealing with the type specimen of *Conchodytes tridacnae* Peters, stated : " Original-Exemplar der Art und Gattung." In my opinion, this is a valid selection of *Conchodytes tridacnae* as the type species of the genus *Conchodytes*, since the type specimen of a genus necessarily must belong to the type species of that genus. However, if this selection is not considered valid, then the same species remains the type of the genus as it is so selected later by Borradaile, 1898 (*Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (7) **2** : 390).

(2) *Hymenocera niponensis* De Haan. On pl. 46 of De Haan's work the word *niponensis* is used instead of *nipponensis*. This obviously is a printer's error, since everywhere else in De Haan's book (pp. 180, 240, erratum) the name is correctly spelt " *nipponensis*." Therefore the Commission is asked, when placing this trivial name on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*, to employ the universally accepted emendation " *nipponensis*."

6. It is clear that the strict application of the *Règles* in the present case would lead to a great confusion, which could be prevented by the use of the plenary powers. The concrete proposals which I submit for consideration are therefore that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should :—

(1) use its plenary powers :—

(*a*) to set aside all selections of type species for the genus *Hymenocera* Latreille, 1819, made prior to the proposed decision ; and having done so

- (*b*) to designate *Hymenocera picta* Dana, 1852, *U.S. Explor. Exped.* **13** : 593, to be the type species of the foregoing genus ;

(2) place on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* the following generic names :—

- (*a*) *Hymenocera* Latreille, 1819, *Nouv. Dict. Hist. nat.* (ed. 2) **30** : 71 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species, as proposed in (1) above to be designated under plenary powers : *Hymenocera picta* Dana, 1852).
- (*b*) *Conchodytes* Peters, 1852, *Ber. Verh. Akad. Wiss. Berlin* **1852** : 588, 591 (gender of generic name : masculine) (type species, selected by Hilgendorf, 1879 (*Mber. Akad. Wiss. Berlin* **1878** : 835) : *Conchodytes tridacnae* Peters, *Ber. Verh. Akad. Wiss. Berlin* **1852** : 594) ;

(3) place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* the generic name *Nematophyllum* Bleeker, 1856 (*Reis Minahassa Moluksch. Arch.* **2** : 37) (type species, by present selection : *Hymenocera picta* Dana, 1852, U.S. Explor. Exped. **13** : 593), a junior homonym of *Nematophyllum* Milne Edwards & Haime, 1850, and an objective junior synonym of *Hymenocera* Latreille, 1819, as placed on the *Official List* under (2) (*a*) above ;

(4) place on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* the following trivial names :—

- (*a*) *picta* Dana, 1852 (as published in the binominal combination *Hymenocera picta*) (trivial name of type species of *Hymenocera* Latreille, 1819) ;
- (*b*) *tridacnae* Peters, 1852 (as published in the binominal combination *Conchodytes tridacnae*) (trivial name of type species of *Conchodytes* Peters, 1852) ;
- (*c*) *nipponensis* (emend. of *niponensis*) De Haan, 1844 (*Fauna Japon.*, Crust. (6/7) : pl. 46) (as published in the binominal combination *Hymenocera nipponensis*).